Higgs-portal assisted Higgs inflation with a large tensor-to-scalar ratio

P. Ko* and Wan-Il Park†
School of Physics, KIAS, Seoul 130-722, Korea
(Dated: November 20, 2014)

We show that the Higgs portal interactions involving extra dark Higgs field ϕ can save generically the original Higgs inflation of the standard model (SM) in light of the constrained low energy parameters and a large tensor-to-scalar ratio (r) hinted by the recent result of BICEP2. Specifically, we show that such interactions disconnect the top quark pole mass from inflationary observables, and allow multi-dimensional parameter space to save the Higgs inflation, thanks to the additional parameters (the dark Higgs boson mass m_ϕ, the mixing angle α between H and ϕ, and the mixed quartic coupling) affecting RG-running of the Higgs quartic coupling. One can easily accommodate $r \sim O(0.1)$ in wide ranges of α and m_ϕ, some region of which can be probed at future colliders.

arXiv:1405.1635v2 [hep-ph] 19 Nov 2014

INTRODUCTION

Even though inflation is a common sense for the very early history of universe, it is embarrassing to see that there is no compelling scenario of inflation based on high energy physics theory. In particular, it is even more puzzling to notice that the large tensor-to-scalar ratio ($r \sim 0.1$) hinted by BICEP2 [1] favors the so-called large field inflation models in which inflaton runs over Planckian field value (see however Ref. [2]). This is because the required flatness of inflaton potential at super-Planckian regime of field value generically requires severe fine tuning.

The claim of BICEP2 has to be confirmed, which may be non-trivial due to too large observational uncertainties [3]. However, irrespective of the reliability of the claim and theoretical issues associated with it, a large r (of $\mathcal{O}(0.01-0.1)$) is an intriguing possibility we want to check out from various data, since it would be the first hint of the very high energy and early history of the Universe that is accessible in the near future.

In order to realize an observationally consistent inflation, we need a scalar field in any case. Because of the recent discovery of the SM Higgs boson, we now have a concrete candidate of inflaton field, namely the SM Higgs field. Indeed it was shown that Higgs field can play the role of inflaton if it has either a large non-minimal coupling to gravity [4] or non-canonical kinetic term [5]. The original Higgs inflation at tree level with a large non-minimal coupling to gravity can not generate a tensor mode with $r \sim 0.1$, whereas the case of non-canonical kinetic term can do [6]. However, a couple of groups show that actually the SM Higgs inflation can fit such a large r for very precise choice of the SM Higgs boson and the top quark pole mass M_t [7, 8] beyond tree level. This is quite interesting, since inflation physics is directly connected to low energy observables. Another group also showed that Higgs portal interaction can save Higgs inflation [9], where the benefit of Higgs portal interaction appeared only via loop contribution. And there is still strong connection between M_t and r, although it becomes little bit milder than the case without Higgs portal [7, 8].

In this letter, we point out that Higgs portal interaction, which is generic in hidden sector DM models [10–18], allows Higgs inflation to produce a sizable tensor mode with $r \sim 0.1$ without resorting M_t. This is due to two additional parameters (in addition to the top quark mass M_t) that can control the running behavior of the Higgs quartic coupling λ_H.

This letter is organized as follows. We first discuss the effect of Higgs portal interaction on the Higgs quartic coupling of SM. Then we show a large enough inflaton potential of Higgs inflation can be obtained by adjusting the mixing angle and/or the mass of non-SM Higgs as well as the mixed quartic coupling even if M_t is fixed to certain value, making some predictions.

HIGGS PORTAL INTERACTIONS AND SCALAR MIXING

As is well known, the SM should be extended in order to accommodate at least non-zero neutrino masses, dark matter, baryo/leptogenesis, and inflation. Especially, many BSM scenarios consist of a hidden sector where dark matter resides and visible sector. Both sectors can communicate via gauge couplings and/or portal interactions as well as gravitational interaction. Among them, Higgs portal interaction is particularly interesting because it allows not only thermal contact of hidden to visible sector but also channel of direct detection. In addition, it can leave imprints on collider experiments. Actually, the Higgs bilinear is the only SM operator which allows a renormalizable contact to hidden sector even for nonabelian dark gauge symmetry [10, 15].

One can imagine various Higgs portal interactions, but in delivering our main point it is enough to consider

$$V \supset \lambda_{\Phi H} |\Phi|^2 H^\dagger H \tag{1}$$

where Φ can be either singlet or multiplet charged under a hidden sector gauge group, or it can be a real singlet. There may be large model-dependence in the hidden sector and the potential of Φ. However the effect of the

Higgs portal interaction Eq. (1) on Higgs inflation is simplified to two cases: (i) $\langle\Phi\rangle = 0$ or (ii) $\langle\Phi\rangle \neq 0$. In the former case, the interaction gives an extra contribution to renormalization group equation of λ_H, and can push it above to avoid zero-crossing. As a result, Higgs inflation becomes possible for a given M_t. In the latter case which has not been discussed in regard of Higgs inflation, there is tree-level effect as well as loop contribution [12]. That is,

$$\lambda_H = \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_\phi^2}{m_h^2}\right)\sin^2\alpha\right]\lambda_H^{\rm SM} \tag{2}$$

where m_ϕ is the extra non-SM Higgs, and $\lambda_H^{\rm SM} \equiv m_h^2/2v_H^2$ is the Higgs quartic coupling of SM. For $m_\phi > m_h$, the non-zero mixing α can remove easily vacuum instability along SM Higgs direction even if loop contribution of $\lambda_{\Phi H}$ might be not large enough.

Note that, for a given top quark pole mass, in case of loop contribution the renormalization scale $\mu_{\rm min}$ where $\lambda_H(\mu_{\rm min})$ is minimized does not vary a lot. On the other hand, if $\lambda_H(\mu \sim m_{\rm ew})$ is shifted at tree level due to α and m_ϕ with a loop-correction of $\lambda_{\Phi H}$ negligible, $\mu_{\rm min}$ is likely to be pushed up to Planck scale. In other words, $\lambda_H(\mu_{\rm min}) \approx 0$ with $\mu_{\rm min}$ a bit smaller than Planck scale is possible from the interplay between α, m_ϕ and $\lambda_{\Phi H}$.

HIGGS-PORTAL ASSISTED HIGGS INFLATION

Once the potential along the SM Higgs direction becomes monotonic, Higgs inflation becomes possible [4]. The basics of Higgs inflation is as follows. The relevant Lagrangian in the Jordan frame is given by [25]

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}}{\sqrt{-g}} = -\frac{1}{2\kappa}\left(1 + \xi\frac{h^2}{M_{\rm Pl}^2}\right)R + \mathcal{L}_h \tag{3}$$

in the unitary gauge, where $\kappa = 8\pi G = 1/M_{\rm Pl}^2$ with $M_{\rm Pl}$ being the reduced Planck mass, and $\mathcal{L}_h$ is the Lagrangian of the SM Higgs field only. In the Einstein frame obtained by the conformal transformation $g^{\mu\nu} \to \Omega^2 g^{\mu\nu}$ with $\Omega^2 \equiv \left(1 + \xi h^2/M_{\rm Pl}^2\right)$, the potential of canonically normalized Higgs field for $h \gg M_{\rm Pl}/\sqrt{\xi}$ is given by

$$U(\chi) = \frac{1}{\Omega^4}\frac{\lambda_H}{4}\left(h^2 - v^2\right)^2 \simeq \frac{\lambda_H M_{\rm Pl}^4}{4\xi^2}\left(1 - e^{-\frac{2\chi}{\sqrt{6}M_{\rm Pl}}}\right)^2 \tag{4}$$

where $v = 246\,{\rm GeV}$ is the vacuum expectation value of h, and

$$\frac{d\chi}{dh} = \frac{\sqrt{1 + \xi\left(1 + 6\xi\right)h^2/M_{\rm Pl}^2}}{1 + \xi h^2/M_{\rm Pl}^2}\ . \tag{5}$$

The potential Eq. (4) is exponentially flat for $\chi \gg \sqrt{3/2}M_{\rm Pl}$, and can drive a slow-roll inflation with slow-roll parameters given by

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{M_{\rm Pl}U'}{U}\right)^2,\ \eta = \frac{M_{\rm Pl}^2 U''}{U} \tag{6}$$

where '$'$' and '$''$' represent respectively the first and second derivatives with respect to χ. Inflation ends when $\epsilon \sim 1$, and the number of e-foldings is given by

$$N_e = \int_{\chi_f}^{\chi_i} d\chi \frac{U}{M_{\rm Pl}^2 U'} = \int_{h_f}^{h_i} dh \frac{U}{M_{\rm Pl}^2 dU/dh}\left(\frac{d\chi}{dh}\right)^2 \tag{7}$$

where subscript i and f stand for the specific time of interest during inflation and the end of inflation, respectively. The power spectra of scalar and tensor perturbations are given by

$$P_{\mathcal{S}} = \left(\frac{H_I}{2\pi}\right)^2\left(\frac{\partial N_e}{\partial\chi}\right)^2 \tag{8}$$

$$P_T = 2\left(\frac{H_I}{2\pi M_{\rm Pl}}\right)^2 \tag{9}$$

Hence the tensor-to-scalar ratio in CMB [19] is given by

$$r = \frac{4P_T}{P_{\mathcal{S}}} = 16\epsilon \tag{10}$$

Recent data from Planck satellite mission showed $P_{\mathcal{S}} \simeq 2.200^{+0.055}_{-0.054} \times 10^{-9}$ at 68% CL (Planck+WP+highL+BAO)[20, 21] at the pivot scale $k_* = 0.05{\rm Mpc}^{-1}$. In addition, BICEP2 recently reported rather a large value for r [1]:

$$r_{0.002} \simeq 0.2^{+0.07}_{-0.05}({\rm or}\ 0.16^{+0.06}_{-0.05})\ {\rm at\ 68\%\ CL}, \tag{11}$$

where the value in the parenthesis is the case of subtracting the dust contribution. If we ignore the spectral running, these two data implies

$$H_I \simeq 10^{14}\,{\rm GeV} \Rightarrow V_I^{1/4} \simeq 2 \times 10^{16}\,{\rm GeV}\ . \tag{12}$$

The original Higgs inflation predicted $r \simeq 0.0033$ for $\xi = 49000\sqrt{\lambda_H^{\rm SM}}$ with $\lambda_H^{\rm SM} \sim 0.1$ which is too small compared with the BICEP2 result. However, this prediction is very naive expectation since λ_H during inflation would not be the same as its value at a low energy (e.g., electroweak scale). That is, one has to use renormalization group (RG)-improved λ_H. Noticing this aspect, several authors pointed out that RG-improved Higgs inflation can $r \sim 0.1$ by adjusting the pole mass of top quark (M_t) [7, 8]. Also, it was pointed out that loop contribution coming from Higgs portal interaction is useful to lift up the energy scale of Higgs inflation [9, 22].

In case of Higgs inflation in the pure SM, the exact value of M_t is crucial and Ref. [7, 8] showed that one need $M_t \sim 171.5\,{\rm GeV}$ for $m_h \sim 126\,{\rm GeV}$ to achieve the high inflation energy consistent with BICEP2 result. However

recent analysis of data from various collider experiments showed that [23]

$$M_t = 173.34 \pm 0.27(\text{stat}) \pm 0.71(\text{sys})\,\text{GeV} \tag{13}$$

indicating that Higgs inflation may be unlikely to occur within the SM. However, if there is Higgs portal interaction, a drastic change can take place, as we show in the following. Generically Higgs portal interaction involves a new symmetry-breaking scalar field, and causes a tree-level mixing between the SM Higgs and the extra non-SM Higgs, as described in the previous section. This mixing is of crucial importance in the physics of Higgs inflation, particularly with heavy M_t which potentially signaling vacuum instability.

When there is a mixing between SM and non-SM Higgses, the tree-level SM Higgs quartic coupling is related to the physical mass of the SM-like Higgs by Eq. (2). In addition, in the presence of the Higgs portal interaction Eq. (1), the RG-equation for the coupling λ_H is given by

$$\frac{d\lambda_H}{d\ln\mu} = \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\left[24\lambda_H^2 - 6y_t^4 + \frac{3}{8}\left(2g_2^2 + \left(g_1^2+g_2^2\right)^2\right) - \lambda_H\left(9g_2^2+3g_1^2-12y_t^2\right) + \lambda_{\Phi H}^2\right] \tag{14}$$

where y_t is the top Yukawa coupling, and $g_{a=1,2}$ are the gauge couplings for the SM $SU(2)_L\times U(1)_Y$ gauge group. Note that Eq. (14) has an additional contribution coming from $\lambda_{\Phi H}$ compared to the case of SM. If $\lambda_{\Phi H}$ has a negligible effect on RG-running of λ_H, but only become the source of Higgs mixing, the running of λ_H is essentially the same as SM, except that the low energy boundary value of λ_H is determined not only by m_h and v_H but also by α and m_ϕ. A proper choice of (α, m_ϕ) can make λ_H to be positive up to Planck scale. However for $M_t \sim 173\,\text{GeV}$ it is difficult to have $\mu_{\min}$ smaller than Planck scale, and we still have to use very large ξ that results in tensor-to-scalar ratio far smaller than $\mathcal{O}(0.1)$.

On the other hand, if $\lambda_{\Phi H}$ is not negligible relative to the other SM contributions in Eq. (14), $\mu_{\min}$ can be adjusted. In this case, we can control α and m_ϕ as well as $\lambda_{\Phi H}$ in order to have $\lambda_{\Phi H}(\mu_{\min})$ arbitrarily small with $\mu_{\min}$ adjustable within several orders of magnitude below Planck scale. The RG-improved inflaton potential at large field region is

$$U(h) \approx \frac{\lambda_H(h/\Omega)}{4}\left(\frac{h}{\Omega}\right)^4 \tag{15}$$

One interesting feature of this RG-improved inflaton potential is that h/Ω is saturated to $M_{\rm Pl}/\sqrt{\xi}$ as for $h \gg M_{\rm Pl}/\sqrt{\xi}$. Hence $\lambda_H(h/\Omega)$ does not run anymore and $U(\chi)$ is also saturated. The importance of this feature is that we can adjust the energy of inflation by taking

$$\mu_{\min} \sim M_{\rm Pl}/\sqrt{\xi} \tag{16}$$

and adjusting $\lambda_H(\mu_{\min})$ by α, m_ϕ and $\lambda_{\Phi H}$ for wide range of M_t. In other words, for a top quark pole mass covering the whole range of current experimental uncertainties, there are chances for the Higgs inflation to realize $r \sim 0.1$, thanks to Higgs portal interaction that causes scalar mixing as well as an additional loop correction to λ_H.

In order to see what happen with the RG-improved inflaton potential Eq. (15), we have recalculated the slow-roll parameters and found

$$\epsilon = \frac{M_{\rm Pl}^2}{2}\left(\frac{dh}{d\chi}\frac{dU}{dh}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{2}\left(4+\frac{\beta_\lambda}{\lambda_H}\right)^2\frac{M_{\rm Pl}^2/h^2}{\sqrt{\Omega^2+6\xi^2h^2/M_{\rm Pl}^2}} \approx \frac{1}{12}\left(4+\frac{\beta_\lambda}{\lambda_H}\right)^2\frac{M_{\rm Pl}^4}{\xi^2h^4} \tag{17}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\eta &= \frac{M_{\rm Pl}^2}{U}\frac{dh}{d\chi}\frac{d}{dh}\left(\frac{dh}{d\chi}\frac{dU}{dh}\right)\\ &= \left(4+\frac{\beta_\lambda}{\lambda_H}\right)\frac{M_{\rm Pl}^2}{h^2}\frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega^2+6\xi^2h^2/M_{\rm Pl}^2}\left\{\frac{1}{\Omega^2}\frac{\beta_\lambda}{\lambda_H}\left[1+\frac{d\ln\left(\beta_\lambda/\lambda_H\right)/d\ln\varphi}{4+\beta_\lambda/\lambda_H}\right]+3-2\frac{d\ln\Omega^2}{d\ln h}-\frac{\xi\left(1+6\xi\right)h^2/M_{\rm Pl}^2}{1+\xi\left(1+6\xi\right)h^2/M_{\rm Pl}^2}\right\}\\ &\simeq -\frac{1}{3}\left(4+\frac{\beta_\lambda}{\lambda_H}\right)\frac{M_{\rm Pl}^2}{\xi h^2}\left\{1-\frac{M_{\rm Pl}^2}{2\xi h^2}\frac{\beta_\lambda}{\lambda_H}\left[1+\frac{d\ln\beta_\lambda/d\ln\varphi-\beta_\lambda/\lambda_H}{4+\beta_\lambda/\lambda_H}\right]\right\}\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where β_λ is the beta-function of λ_H, and $\varphi \equiv h/\Omega$. If we set $\beta_\lambda = 0$ implying absence of RG-running, usual re-

sult of the original Higgs inflation is recovered, and one finds a relation $\epsilon = \frac{3}{4}\eta^2$. Even if $\beta_\lambda \neq 0$, if still the second term in $\{...\}$ in the last line of Eq. (18) is negligible, one finds a same relation. Then, from $n_s = 1 - 6\epsilon + 2\eta$ for the spectral index of density perturbation, one finds $\eta \simeq (n_s - 1)/2$. This results in $r \simeq 3\,(n_s - 1)^2$ which can not be of $\mathcal{O}(0.1)$. Therefore, matching BICEP2 result requires that the term with $\frac{M_{\rm Pl}^2}{2\xi h^2}\frac{\beta_\lambda}{\lambda_H}$ in the last line of Eq. (18) should play some roles at cosmological scales of interest. One observation is that, when it is sizable relative to β_λ/λ_H, $d\ln\beta_\lambda/d\ln\varphi$ (the curvature of λ_H with respect to the renormalization scale or φ) can control the behavior of η and n_s. Note that $d\ln\beta_\lambda/d\ln\varphi$ depends on $\beta_{\lambda_{\Phi H}}$ (the beta-function of $\lambda_{\Phi H}$) as well as $\lambda_{\Phi H}$. Hence, the RG-running of $\lambda_{\Phi H}$ becomes also crucial, and it can be controlled by model-dependent parameter(s).

Although it is clear enough, we now demonstrate our argument, using the singlet fermion dark matter model [11] in order to use the definite full RG-equations involving λ_H and $\lambda_{\Phi H}$. In Fig. 1, we show how the Jordan-frame Higgs potential (V_h) depends on the mixing angle α for fixed values of m_ϕ and $\lambda_{\Phi H}$. It is clear that for a



FIG. 1: V_h of Jordan frame in SFDM for $m_h = 125\,\text{GeV}$, $M_t = 173.2\,\text{GeV}$, $m_\phi = 500\,\text{GeV}$, $\lambda_{SH} = 0.055$, $\lambda_S = 0.2$, and $\lambda_\psi = 0.4$.

given m_ϕ the inflection point is determined by delicate interplay between α and $\lambda_{\Phi H}$. Note that one can achieve nearly the same behavior of the Higgs potential by adjusting m_ϕ instead of α. Fig. 2 shows the inflaton potential originating from V_h with an inflection point. Again, it is clear that by taking a proper ξ matching to $\mu_{\rm min}$ via the relation of Eq. (16), we can adjust the energy scale of inflation.

The e-foldings associated with a cosmological scale λ is given by [24]

$$N_\lambda = 45 + \ln\left(\frac{\lambda}{\text{Mpc}}\right) + \frac{2}{3}\ln\left(\frac{V_I^{1/4}}{10^{14}\,\text{GeV}}\right) + \frac{1}{3}\ln\left(\frac{T_{\rm R}}{10^{10}\,\text{GeV}}\right) \quad (19)$$



FIG. 2: $U(h)$ of Eq. (15) in SFDM for the parameter set same as Fig. 1 but $\alpha = 0.074222$.

where $T_{\rm R}$ is the reheating temperature after inflation. At the benchmark point used in Fig. 2, $V_I \sim 9\times10^{64}\,\text{GeV}^4$ during inflation. Since radiation dominates the universe right after inflation in this scenario with $\xi \sim 10$ [8] [26], one finds $T_{\rm R} \sim V_I^{1/4} \sim 1.7\times10^{16}\,\text{GeV}$. Based on this, numerical analysis was performed for a pivot scale $k_* = 0.05\text{Mpc}^{-1}$, and the result is summarized in Table I. As

N_e	$h_*/M_{\rm Pl}$	ϵ_*	η_*	$10^9 P_S$	n_s	r
56	0.72	0.00525	−0.00190	2.1777	0.9647	0.0840

TABLE I: Inflation parameters and observables in SFDM for the parameter set same as Fig. 1 but $\alpha = 0.07422199$ and $\xi = 12.8294$ which corresponds to $1.022\times(M_{\rm Pl}/\mu_{\rm min})^2$.

shown in the table, we can obtain r close to 0.1 with the other observables consistent with Planck mission data.

The scale dependence of the density perturbation in our scenario is intrinsic due to the scale dependence of λ_H. This aspect is true of the Higgs inflation in SM too. However, the new critical aspect of our scenario is that it is possible to control the spectral behavior by adjusting BSM parameters (e.g., λ_S and λ in SFDM). The running of the spectral index is given by

$$n_s' = -6\epsilon\,(4\epsilon - 2\eta) - 2\eta\sqrt{2\epsilon}\frac{\Omega^2 f(x,y) M_{\rm P}/h}{\sqrt{\Omega^2 + 6\xi^2 h^2/M_{\rm P}^2}}, \quad (20)$$

where '$'$' denotes the derivative w.r.t $\ln k$ and

$$f(x,y) = \frac{x}{\Omega^2}\frac{y-x}{4+x} - 2 + \frac{1+\frac{y-x}{4+x}+\frac{2+x}{\Omega^2}\left(\frac{y-x}{4+x}\right)^2 - \frac{\beta_\lambda''/\beta_\lambda - y^2}{2\Omega^2(4+x)}}{\xi h^2/\left(xM_{\rm P}^2\right) - \left(1+\frac{y-x}{4+x}\right)/2}, \tag{21}$$

with $x \equiv \beta_\lambda/\lambda_H$, $y \equiv d\ln\beta_\lambda/d\ln\varphi$ and $\beta_\lambda'' \equiv d^2\beta_\lambda/d(\ln\varphi)^2$. Consistency with Planck data requires $n_s' = -0.021 \pm 0.011$ (68%; Planck + WP) at $k_* = 0.05\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ [21]. As shown in Fig. 3, it is possible



FIG. 3: Parameter space for a spectral running in SFDM for the parameter set same as Table I.

to match the observation if $(x,y) \sim (-3.5,-3.75)$ or $(-4.5,-4.5)$. For $\lambda_H \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-6})$ which is necessary to have a very flat inflection point in Higgs potential and realize a large tensor-to-scalar ratio, this implies that $\beta_\lambda \sim -\mathcal{O}(10^{-5})$ and $\beta_\lambda' \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$. Hence, a tuning is necessary for the required value of β_λ. This scale dependence can be used to test the model or determining model parameters precisely. In this sense, it would be interesting to see if Higgs inflation in pure SM can pass this test while Higgs-portal assisted Higgs inflation may do.

CONCLUSIONS

In this letter, we pointed out that in the presence of Higgs portal interaction Higgs inflation with a large tensor-to-scalar ratio ($r \sim 0.1$) does not necessarily mean a direct connection of masses of SM Higgs (m_h) and top quark (M_t) to inflationary observables. The Higgs portal interaction is quite generic in scenarios beyond the SM. Generically, it involves non-SM scalar field(s) and causes scalar mixing, The mixing angle (α) and mass of non-SM Higgs (m_ϕ) as well as the coupling (say, $\lambda_{\Phi H}$) of a Higgs portal interaction play crucial roles in low energy phenomenology and dark matter physics. Additionally, they make m_h and M_t free from inflationary physics, since they can make SM Higgs potential absolute stable and shape it to fit observables of inflation, for example, the large tensor-to-scalar ratio hinted by BICEP2 result. We demonstrated numerically these interesting aspects of Higgs portal interaction, using the model of singlet fermion dark matter as an example. Note that the dark Higgs field is very generic in hidden sector DM models where the DM is stabilized by local dark symmetry and thermalized by Higgs portal interaction. It is amusing that the dark Higgs guarantees the DM stability and improves the stability of EW vacuum as well as assists the Higgs inflation with $r \sim O(0.1)$.

This work is supported in part by National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) Research Grant 2012R1A2A1A01006053, and also by SRC program of NRF funded by MEST (20120001176) through Korea Neutrino Research Center at Seoul National University (PK).

* pko@kias.re.kr
† wipark@kias.re.kr

[1] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [BICEP2 Collaboration], arXiv:1403.3985 [astro-ph.CO].
[2] S. Choudhury and A. Mazumdar, arXiv:1403.5549 [hep-th].
[3] R. Adam *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1409.5738 [astro-ph.CO].
[4] F. L. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **659**, 703 (2008) [arXiv:0710.3755 [hep-th]].
[5] C. Germani and A. Kehagias, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 011302 (2010) [arXiv:1003.2635 [hep-ph]].
[6] C. Germani, Y. Watanabe and N. Wintergerst, arXiv:1403.5766 [hep-ph].
[7] Y. Hamada, H. Kawai, K. -y. Oda and S. C. Park, arXiv:1403.5043 [hep-ph].
[8] F. Bezrukov and M. Shaposhnikov, arXiv:1403.6078 [hep-ph].
[9] N. Haba and R. Takahashi, arXiv:1404.4737 [hep-ph].
[10] T. Hur and P. Ko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 141802 (2011) [arXiv:1103.2571 [hep-ph]].
[11] S. Baek, P. Ko and W. -I. Park, JHEP **1202**, 047 (2012) [arXiv:1112.1847 [hep-ph]].
[12] S. Baek, P. Ko, W. -I. Park and E. Senaha, JHEP **1211**, 116 (2012) [arXiv:1209.4163 [hep-ph]].
[13] S. Baek, P. Ko, W. -I. Park and E. Senaha, JHEP **1305**, 036 (2013) [arXiv:1212.2131 [hep-ph]].
[14] S. Baek, P. Ko and W. -I. Park, JHEP **1307**, 013 (2013) [arXiv:1303.4280 [hep-ph]].

[15] S. Baek, P. Ko and W. -I. Park, arXiv:1311.1035 [hep-ph].
[16] S. Baek, P. Ko, W. -I. Park and Y. Tang, arXiv:1402.2115 [hep-ph].
[17] P. Ko and Y. Tang, arXiv:1402.6449 [hep-ph].
[18] P. Ko and Y. Tang, arXiv:1404.0236 [hep-ph].
[19] E. Komatsu *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], Astrophys. J. Suppl. **192**, 18 (2011) [arXiv:1001.4538 [astro-ph.CO]].
[20] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5062 [astro-ph.CO].
[21] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5076 [astro-ph.CO].
[22] Y. Hamada, H. Kawai and K. -y. Oda, arXiv:1404.6141 [hep-ph].
[23] [ATLAS and CDF and CMS and D0 Collaborations], arXiv:1403.4427 [hep-ex].
[24] E. Kolb and M. Tuner, Westview Press (1994)
[25] Here we ignore the nonminimal coupling for the dark Higgs field for simplicity, relegating its study to the future publication.
[26] For $\xi \sim 10$, the issue of perturbative unitarity becomes less severe.